

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Lake Havasu Field Office (LHFO) has prepared the Draft *Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement* (DRMP/DEIS) to provide comprehensive current and future management of the more than 1.3 million acres of BLM-administered public land located within the LHFO planning area, which comprises portions of Mohave, La Paz, Yavapai, and Maricopa Counties in Arizona and San Bernardino County in California (Map 1-1). This plan represents many months of ongoing, coordinated efforts on the part of BLM LHFO staff, BLM Arizona State Office staff, representatives of communities located within the planning area, cooperating and collaborating government agencies, special interest and user groups, and hundreds of concerned citizens. The decisions outlined in this document will enable BLM to manage the resources and uses of BLM-administered public lands located within the LHFO planning area as a comprehensive unit.

Purpose and Need

The current planning area was formerly known as the Havasu Resource Area of the Yuma District. BLM has restructured management responsibility for public lands a few times starting on December 15, 1991, transferring portions of four other planning areas within Arizona into the Havasu Resource Area. The Havasu Resource Area became the Lake Havasu Field Office in 1997. Map 1-2 shows the boundaries of the plans that apply within the current LHFO boundaries. Currently, LHFO manages resources under four different land use plans: the *Yuma District Resource Management Plan* (1987), *Kingman Resource Area Resource Management Plan* (1995), *Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan* (1988) and *Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan* (1983). The present DRMP combines the relevant portions of those documents and updates the plan with issues and concerns identified during the scoping process.

Sections 102 and 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) require the Secretary of the Interior to develop land use plans for all public lands. This DRMP/DEIS conforms to FLPMA and BLM planning regulations as set forth in Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 1600.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires federal agencies to prepare EISs on major federal actions. Since the DRMP is a major federal action, this DRMP is accompanied by a DEIS. The DEIS documents the potential environmental impact of implementing the preferred DRMP alternative as well as other alternatives and conforms to U.S. Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500).

The purpose of preparing the LHFO DRMP is to provide direction that will guide future land management actions for BLM-managed lands within the planning area. The DRMP identifies management issues, determines management objectives and actions, and establishes monitoring methods to facilitate multiple use and sustained yield management for the entire planning area. This document must provide not only adequate guidance for management actions but also show that actions taken were supported by the appropriate NEPA and FLPMA processes.

FLPMA directs BLM to manage the public lands and their various resource values for multiple use and sustained yield to ensure that they are utilized in a manner that will best meet the present and future needs of the public. As required by these Acts of Congress and current BLM policy, BLM prepared this DRMP to establish management directions for the balanced use of such renewable and non-renewable resources as rangeland, wildlife, wilderness, recreation, cultural resources, and other natural, scenic, scientific, and historical values within the planning area.

Planning Area Description

The planning area boundary includes the Colorado River from Davis Dam in the north, (bordering Nevada/Arizona) to south of Parker Dam. On the California side, the planning area varies in width from less than one-quarter mile to approximately 6 miles west of the Colorado River. The planning area also trends east to Alamo Dam and the Harcuvar Mountains, which are located near the community of Wenden, Arizona. The planning area includes two incorporated cities, Lake Havasu City, Bullhead City, and the town of Parker, Arizona, along with more than a dozen smaller communities, and encompasses more than 1.3 million acres of BLM administered public land, resources, and uses. See Map 1-1.

Located within the planning area are the Havasu National Wildlife Refuge, Bill Williams River National Wildlife Refuge, five designated BLM wilderness areas, and other critical fisheries, migratory waterfowl, and desert plant and wildlife habitats. Seven Native American tribes (Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Yavapai-Prescott Tribe, and Colorado River Indian Tribes) either currently reside within boundaries of the planning area or have recognized cultural ties to these lands.

The area is widely known as a recreation destination and seasonal population changes significantly influence waterway and land use within the planning area. The Lake Havasu Convention and Visitor Center estimates that recreational visitation during both the winter and summer tourist seasons increases the area's base population of approximately 55,000 by another 15,000–20,000 persons (Cunning pers comm.). Visitation thus plays a substantial role in both the regional economy, and land uses within the planning area.

Land Status/Surface Management

BLM administers 1,363,645 acres of public land within the 2,096,865-acre planning area. This area includes approximately 79,825 acres of U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) acquired and withdrawn land (Table 1-1, Map 1-1).

Table 1-1. Surface Management within the Lake Havasu Planning Area

Land Status	Acreage	Percentage
Federal		
Bureau of Land Management	1,359,981	64.86%
Fish & Wildlife Service	45,835	2.18%
National Park Service	1,626	0.08%
Corps of Engineers	11,932	0.57%
Subtotal	1,419,374	67.69%
Tribal Lands		
Subtotal	177,356	8.46%
State		
Arizona Game & Fish Department	465	0.02%
State Trust Lands	245,471	11.71%
Arizona State Parks	3,545	0.17%
Subtotal	249,481	11.90%
Private		
County and City Parks	614	0.03%
Private	250,040	11.92%
Subtotal	250,654	11.95%
Total	2,096,865	100.00%

Generally, public lands within the planning area consist of large, contiguous blocks containing scattered state and private land holdings, known as

“inholdings.” In a few locations, public lands are isolated or “checkerboarded” between state and private lands. Most of the state and private lands are located in populated areas associated with the Colorado River and along the highways that transect the area. While the planning area encompasses more than BLM-administered public lands, actions and decisions created by the DRMP will be limited to public lands administered by BLM. Federal agencies, tribes, private landowners, and state and local municipal entities within the planning area have been and will continue to be consulted throughout the scoping and planning process.

Mission Statements

BLM’s mission is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

In keeping with its mandate for developing multi-use management plans, BLM developed an overall vision for the LHFO planning area that supports a rich variety of public experiences while simultaneously providing for long-term protection of the area’s natural resources. BLM will provide opportunities for environmentally responsible recreation and commercial activities, and address community expansion needs along the Colorado River. Additionally, BLM will manage resources wisely, while promoting citizen-based partnerships through public awareness and education.

Planning Process

Collaboration/Partnership Relationship

Collaboration and cooperation are practices that BLM emphasizes in its approach to the planning process. Informal work during the pre-planning period led to increased interaction between BLM staff and communities during the scoping and alternative development phases of the planning effort. BLM held a series of Partnership Meetings in 2001 designed to encourage easy communication between BLM and the communities. The formal scoping process began on August 3, 2001 with publication in the Federal Register (66 FR 40717) of the Notice of Intent to prepare the DRMP/DEIS.

During 2001 and 2003, BLM held a series of open houses for both scoping and alternative development in central community locations (Parker, Bullhead City, Lake Havasu City, Brenda, Bouse, and Salome, Arizona, and Needles, California). The informal, multiple-meeting approach allowed for learning, reflection, and collaborative work between meetings on both the part of citizens and BLM managers. Citizen interests could be viewed side by side with BLM management concerns. This approach provided planners with the ability to integrate management concerns with community interests in ways that foster collaboration and, more importantly, shared land stewardship.

BLM continued collaboration efforts by including communities in the formulation of alternatives. The open houses gave citizens the opportunity to refine issues, discuss visions for BLM lands, and begin exploring alternative ways to manage BLM lands and resources. Input received from citizens—both groups and individuals—was considered in developing the alternatives. Citizens could also submit formulated alternatives. These submissions were also considered in the range of alternatives and analyzed in the DEIS, as required by NEPA. BLM attended numerous meetings to discuss DRMP issues when invited.

Comments were received throughout the planning process. BLM maintained a mailing list and provided planning bulletins and news releases to describe the status of the planning process and to request comments. Additionally, informational flyers were distributed through the mail and by hand (at boat ramps, concessions, Lake Havasu 2002 Winterfest, community meetings, and at LHFO) to solicit input.

The LHFO website (<http://www.az.blm.gov/lhfo/index.htm>) posted information about the plan and encouraged participation throughout the planning process. If this site is unavailable, the information may be accessed at http://www.blm.gov/nhp/spotlight/state_info/planning.htm, and by clicking on the “Arizona” link. Links were also made between private websites and the LHFO website to further expand discussion on the DRMP. Comments will continue to be accepted throughout the planning process.

Overall, the goal was for this collaborative context to result in open communications and an increased sense of public ownership of the planning process, the decisions that result from it, and the importance of collaborative stewardship as a strategy for implementation.

Intergovernmental, Inter-Agency, and Tribal Relationships

In developing this DRMP/DEIS, BLM coordinated with BOR; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); Federal Highway Administration; Arizona Game and Fish Department (Regions 3 and 4); Arizona Department of Transportation; Arizona State Parks; the cities of Lake Havasu City, Bullhead City, and Needles; Mohave County; La Paz County; San Bernardino County; the town of Parker; and with Lake Havasu Fisheries Improvement Program partners, including the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and Anglers United.

BLM initiated consultation with tribes who have oral traditions or cultural concerns relating to the planning area, or who are documented as having occupied or used portions of the planning area during prehistoric or historic times. These tribes include the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, Colorado River Indian Tribes, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, and Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. Four tribes, the

Chemehuevi, Fort Mohave, Hopi, and Colorado River Indian Tribes, requested follow-up meetings.

Bureau of Reclamation Project Lands

Several hundred thousand acres of Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) land, both acquired and withdrawn, accommodate the Boulder Canyon and related projects from Davis Dam to Mexico, including lands within the planning area. Under a unique provision of the Department of the Interior Departmental Manual (613 DM 1.1), the Secretary assigned management responsibilities for certain resources on these withdrawn lands to BLM, in coordination with BOR.

These lands constitute a corridor along the lower Colorado River in Arizona and California, and are managed by BLM for recreation and wildlife uses. However, they remain BOR lands, and their use is dedicated primarily to support various BOR projects. This section of the DM was added in 1972, following completion of the *Lower Colorado River Land Use Plan* in 1964 by the Office of the Secretary of Interior.

BLM and BOR work and coordinate closely on the management of these lands. While BLM exercises primary day-to-day management for non-BOR project uses, BOR retains certain management responsibilities to maintain the projects.

BOR and other cooperators completed the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Plan in 2005. This plan represents a comprehensive species conservation approach to both federal actions and non-federal activities on the Lower Colorado River. All participating Department of Interior officials are directed to cooperate and implement such agreements to achieve the important species conservation actions identified within the plan.

Management

BLM has a unique responsibility for management of BOR project lands pursuant to the Departmental Manual at 613 DM 1. About 80,000 acres of land within the planning area are BOR lands that have been withdrawn from the public lands or acquired from non-federal owners to accommodate BOR projects along the lower Colorado River. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through BOR, retains the role of Watermaster for the lower Colorado River, and for operation of the various dams, river works, and irrigation project facilities authorized by Congress.

To maximize opportunities for recreational and multiple-use management, BLM has the responsibility of managing these lands, in coordination with BOR, for recreation, wildlife, and other non-BOR project purposes. BOR relies on BLM to take the lead role in non-BOR project management of the BOR lands along the lower Colorado River.

It is important for the reader to understand that on these lands, BOR retains the responsibility for Reclamation project operation and maintenance, and certain environmental mitigation and enhancement activities associated with its mission. Every effort has been made by BLM and BOR to ensure that this DRMP does not conflict with existing and planned BOR project activities. In addition, BOR will make every effort to assist BLM in implementation of this DRMP. However, on BOR lands included in this DRMP, project operational situations may arise that would preclude full implementation of certain DRMP prescriptions, or may cause curtailment, modification, or delay of portions of certain DRMP decisions affecting BOR lands.

Cooperating Agency Status

In the first sentence of NEPA, Congress declares that

It is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, and other concerned public and private organizations...to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans. (Sec. 101(a))

Additionally, U.S. Council on Environmental Quality regulations contained in 40 CFR 1501.6 and 1508.5 implement the NEPA mandate that federal agencies responsible for preparing NEPA analysis and documentation do so “in cooperation with state and local governments” and other agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise (42 United States Code [USC] 4331(a), 4332(2)).

In support of this mandate, BLM invited a broad range of local, state, tribal, and federal agencies to attend a series of meetings with the aim of developing Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that would establish cooperating agency status with BLM. Cooperating agency status offers the opportunity for interested agencies to assume additional roles and responsibilities beyond the collaborative planning processes of attending public meetings and reviewing and commenting on plan documents. MOUs are time-limited documents that describe the roles and responsibilities of BLM and the cooperating agency during the planning process for a particular DRMP.

Four agencies requested Cooperating Agency Status for the LFHO Resource Management Plan (RMP): Arizona Department of Transportation, Arizona Game and Fish Department, BOR and the Federal Highways Administration. BOR is considered a Cooperating Agency because a valid MOU, dated July 15, 1991 exists between BLM and BOR, in which BOR agreed to be “a cooperating agency on land use plans, including amendments, affecting resources on project lands administered by BLM.”

Other Stakeholder Relationships

Lake Havasu Fisheries Improvement Partnership

By 1990, what had been an excellent Lake Havasu fishery was experiencing a prolonged downturn in productivity and angler satisfaction. Planning efforts intended to improve the condition of the fishery soon involved BLM, BOR, USFWS, the Arizona Game and Fish Department, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and the California Department of Fish and Game. These six parties had broad-based authorities on Lake Havasu to manage fish habitat, the associated natural resources, and the surrounding shoreline. In 1992, these parties collaborated on a plan to improve angler satisfaction through fish habitat installations in 42 coves, and to develop free public access shoreline fishing facilities at eight different locations on Lake Havasu.

This effort became the largest and most comprehensive warmwater fish improvement program ever undertaken in the U.S. The planning cooperative was eventually formalized through MOAs and Cooperative Agreements to form the Lake Havasu Fisheries Improvement Partnership. Three levels of partner coordination were initiated, ranging from Executive Regional Directors to field-level experts, and coordination meetings of those voluntary partners occurred regularly at each level to guide, fund, and enable the various program goals. Work began in 1993 with a proposed 10-year schedule and a government cost estimate of \$28.5 million.

By 2005, the Partnership accomplished a significant number of program goals: stocking 30,000 endangered razorback suckers (2001), 875 acres of artificial reef habitat improvements (2002), the fifth of six planned recreational shoreline fishing areas at the Bill Williams River National Wildlife Refuge (2003), and stocking 30,000 endangered bonytail chub (2004).

More than 150,000 volunteer hours were contributed to these accomplishments through the decade of cooperation. The economic benefit of the partnership is best demonstrated in the fact that less than \$15 million has been invested to reach this point, yet a 2001 economic analysis of the program concludes that recreational fishing produces more than a \$30 million annual benefit to the community. The results of this investment will be maintained and monitored far into the future by the partners involved to assure public safety, environmental vitality, and a better scientific understanding of the aquatic habitat of Lake Havasu.

Scoping Process/Issues

DRMPs are prepared to resolve significant issues and management concerns associated with the management of the public lands in the DRMP planning area. The issues drive the DRMP in that the proposed DRMP and the other alternatives are primarily designed to resolve the identified planning issues.

The BLM interdisciplinary planning team used the scoping process to identify issues relevant to the LHFO planning area. Through communication media such as meetings, newsletters, and news releases, the public was provided opportunities to identify issues that needed to be addressed in the DRMP/DEIS. The planning team then analyzed the public's comments and identified the major planning issues to be resolved. The specific criteria by which changes in current resource management practices were considered are:

- Management of one resource significantly constrains or curtails use of another resource.
- Existing land use allocations conflict with agency resource management policies or guidance.
- Existing resource management practices conflict with management plans, policies, and guidance of another federal or state surface management agency.
- Documented public controversy regarding management of a specific resource value indicates a management issue.

Issues Regarding Desired Resource Conditions

In August 2002, BLM published the *Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan Scoping Report*. This document summarized the procedures, issues, and management concerns that were identified over 2 years as the result of public meetings, comments received through the mail, and via email. A summary of the issues (identified by the public) and the management concerns (identified by BLM staff) is presented below. More detailed information on the issues and management concerns is presented in Appendix A. Following the publication of the Scoping Report, BLM continued to solicit input from the public, agencies, and staff members. Those additional comments all fell within the issues identified in the Scoping Report.

Issues

Issue 1: Aquatic Habitat (Fisheries)

BLM is responsible for the management of aquatic habitat in Lake Havasu from the river channel to the high water marks. Management of fish resources includes both game species and threatened and endangered species. The prevalent issue is how BLM should manage these aquatic habitats.

Issue 2: Cultural Resource Protection

BLM must protect significant cultural resources located on public lands. Lands with significant cultural resources including Native American values/traditional uses should be identified and their need for protection evaluated. Options

include allocating sites for various uses including Traditional use, designating Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) or other special management areas, or nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

Issue 3: Disposal and Acquisition of Public Lands

The DRMP/DEIS should address whether land parcels in the planning area should be retained in public ownership and what criteria should be used to determine whether parcels are suitable for disposal. Lands not retained need to be identified by BLM for disposal through exchange, sale, or Recreation and Public Purposes Act patent.

Issue 4: Livestock Grazing

The proper allocation of forage for livestock grazing is critical to maintaining vegetative and watershed values in a healthy condition. The needs of all uses and important resources, including special status species, soil stability, and water quality, must be carefully considered, and livestock grazing practices must be compatible with other resource management objectives.

Issue 5: Minerals Management

Mineral activity on public lands in the planning area should be managed in accordance with other land and resource uses and values. Issues to consider include how to manage locatable minerals, leasable minerals, and saleable minerals, in addition to split-estate lands (defined in the glossary).

Issue 6: Off-Highway Vehicles

BLM manages more than 1 million acres potentially suitable for off-highway vehicle travel. It is the goal of the planning process to designate public lands open, limited, or closed to off-highway vehicle use, while considering land tenure or ownership adjustments, threatened and endangered species and other wildlife issues, cultural resource concerns, and patterns of public use.

Issue 7: Protection of Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources consist of the remains of past (often ancient) life preserved in sedimentary rock. Issues include identifying paleontological sites and determining the level of protection best suited for each site.

Issue 8: Recreation on Public Lands

Special attention is needed to address recreation on public lands. BLM must prescribe and regulate recreation uses across concentrated and dispersed recreation areas for millions of visitors to public land. Issues to be addressed include what type of recreation opportunities should be allowed and what services and facilities BLM should provide.

Issue 9: Special Status Species

BLM must consider special status species in the planning area and determine if there is a need to designate additional lands as ACECs or other special management areas for their protection.

Issue 10: Transportation and Public Access

Much of the planning area consists of intermingled public, private, and state lands. Due to this mixed pattern of ownership, the issues that BLM should address include managing cross-jurisdictional transportation networks (both motorized and non-motorized), as well as utility corridors/rights-of-way, access for the physically disabled, and sensitive natural resources.

Issue 11: Visual Resources

Visual Resource Management provides a means for classifying public land into one of four categories based on the area's scenic values, sensitivity factors, and distance from key viewpoints. Visual Resource Management issues can include addressing the suitability of current inventories and locating proposed developments on public lands to reduce negative visual impacts.

Issue 12: Wild and Scenic Rivers

Three segments of the Bill Williams River within the BLM planning area were recommended as suitable in the Arizona Statewide Wild & Scenic Rivers Legislative EIS (BLM 1994). This system was defined in the 1968 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The act prescribed the method by which additional components may be added to the system by Congress. Although Congress has not acted on the Bill Williams River recommendation, BLM must manage these river segments to protect the outstandingly remarkable values identified in the EIS, and thereby suitability for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Issue 13: Wild Horses and Burros

BLM is responsible for the management and protection of wild burros in the planning area. Possible adjustments to the current Herd Management Area boundaries and the Appropriate Management Levels should to be addressed.

Issue 14: Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas

The Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 requires that BLM manage five distinct Wilderness Areas as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System and according to the Wilderness Act of 1964. The 1990 act also retained one Wilderness Study Area for continued management so as to not impair the ability of Congress to designate this area as Wilderness. LHFO also manages small portions of three wilderness areas designated by the California Desert Protection Act of 1994. The boundaries of all of these areas were set by Congress and

cannot be modified by this DRMP. However, BLM can address alternative means to protect wilderness values and determine possible adverse effects to these Wilderness Areas from the management of other resources.

Issue 15: Wildlife Management

One of the principal goals of BLM management is ensuring the health and productivity of all wildlife habitats. BLM should specifically address issues of wildlife corridors/habitat connectivity; the elimination or reduction of non-native noxious, invasive, or feral species; and management of vegetation, fish, and wildlife species habitats in terms of sustaining healthy, viable habitats.

Management Concerns

In addition to issues identified during the scoping process, nine management concerns (i.e., concerns expressed by BLM resource specialists) were brought forward during the planning process. These concerns are presented below.

Management Concern 1: Back Country Byways

Back Country Byways are important to the local and regional communities. BLM must decide if existing Back Country Byways should be maintained and whether additional byways should be identified.

Management Concern 2: Fire Ecology

BLM must coordinate with other responsible agencies to manage wildland fire in accordance with the nationwide BLM fire policy. BLM should also determine the level of potential risk to the public from controlled or illegal burns on public lands and whether the current Fire Management Plan is sufficient.

Management Concern 3: Public Health and Safety

BLM seeks to ensure public health and safety on public lands through an active BLM safety program. As part of this program, BLM will address safety concerns related to off-highway vehicle use, target shooting, abandoned mines and hazardous materials on public lands, and other potential risks to public health.

Management Concern 4: Renewable Energy

In May 2001, the President adopted a National Energy Policy that identified a major role for the public lands and resources to meet the nation's increasing energy needs. With this policy in mind, BLM must determine what sites are available in the planning area for future alternative energy needs.

Management Concern 5: Riparian Areas and Wetlands

Special management attention is needed to ensure these fragile areas are protected, improved, and functioning properly, while providing for their use. BLM management should protect and enhance riparian areas, determine resource condition, levels of use and priority, and establish objectives for restoration where needed throughout the watershed.

Management Concern 6: Special Area Designations

Public lands have a variety of important historic, cultural, scenic, wildlife, botanical, mineral, and water values. Designations for ACEC may be used to protect these areas. Such designations may also be used to identify and manage areas that are hazardous to human life and property.

Management Concern 7: Utility and Communication Corridors

The private sector uses public lands for a variety of infrastructure-related purposes. Careful planning is necessary to ensure that other resources are not significantly harmed when BLM decides where utility corridors and telecommunication sites will be maintained, modified, or established.

Management Concern 8: Vegetation

Vegetation is an integral part of an ecosystem. BLM management of the vegetative resources on public lands affects the total health of the environment. Management objectives must focus on controlling noxious or invasive weeds, establishing desired future conditions for vegetative resources, and developing methods to protect and enhance plant species and habitats.

Management Concern 9: Water

Water resources must be made available to the public while ensuring compliance with the Clean Water Act. In complying with this act, BLM must develop management objectives that address the current and potential threats to water quality and quantity such as pollution, recreational uses, and urban growth.

Management Concern 10: Wilderness Characteristics

BLM has the authority to address wilderness characteristics and prescribe goals, objectives, and management actions in land use plans. BLM wanted to clarify to the public that wilderness characteristics would be considered and proposed for management in the plan.

Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Planning Criteria

The BLM planning process is governed by FLPMA (43 USC 1711) and 43 CFR 1600, which govern the administrative review process for most BLM decisions. Land use plans ensure that BLM-administered public lands are managed in accordance with the intent of Congress as stated in FLPMA, under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. As required by FLPMA, public lands must be managed in a manner that protects the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archaeological values; that, where appropriate, preserves and protects certain public lands in their natural condition and provides food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestic animals; and that provides for outdoor recreation and human occupancy and use by encouraging collaboration and public participation throughout the planning process. In addition, public lands must be managed in a manner that recognizes the nation's need for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber from public lands.

Land use plans are the primary mechanism for guiding BLM activities to achieve the mission and goals outlined in the BLM Strategic Plan (Bureau of Land Management 1997). The LHFO DRMP/DEIS was produced in accordance with all applicable federal statutes and regulations (Appendix B). The selected planning approach is consistent with the requirements found in FLPMA and BLM regulations as most currently defined in the revised BLM *Land Use Planning Handbook* (H-1601-1). The process is also compliant with the set of instruction memoranda, information bulletins, and other appropriate BLM manuals, handbooks, and strategic plans that embody the most current BLM business practices regarding conduct of the process and content that resulting documents must contain.

A number of existing management plans, programmatic documents, and standards and guidelines were considered in the preparation of the DRMP/DEIS. These documents include:

- *Kingman Resource Management Plan* (Bureau of Land Management, Kingman Resource Area Office 1995),
- *Yuma District Resource Management Plan* (Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office 1987),
- *Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan* (Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District Office 1983),
- *Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan* (Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix District Office 1988),
- *Arizona Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Administration* (Bureau of Land Management, Arizona State Office 1997), and

- *Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic Rivers Legislative Environmental Impact Statement* (Bureau of Land Management, Arizona State Office 1994).

These documents have been examined not only to assure appropriate integration and compliance, but also to identify information that is still appropriate for inclusion in the DRMP and/or decisions that are still valid and can be carried forward into the documents being prepared. Activity plans that have been tiered off these plans have also been considered in this planning effort, but may require revision to be consistent with the new DRMP.

Implementation of a DRMP for public lands is subject to numerous laws and regulations, as well as a general requirement for consistency with pre-existing and applicable plans. For a more detailed list of applicable laws and regulations that affect the planning process, see Appendix B. The following are considered the most pertinent Laws and Agreements:

- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976;
- Wilderness Act of 1964;
- Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990;
- Sikes Act of 1974;
- Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978;
- Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971, as amended;
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979;
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended 1992;
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990;
- Clean Water Act of 1977 as amended;
- Master MOU between the Arizona Game and Fish Commission and BLM, dated March 18, 1987;
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934, as amended;
- MOU between BOR and BLM dated July 15, 1991;
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-711), of 1918 Migratory Bird Executive Order 13186; and
- Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 USC 1531) et seq., as amended.

Planning Criteria

Planning criteria are the standards, rules, and measures used to guide data collection, alternative formulation, and final plan selection. Criteria are taken from laws and regulations, BLM guidance, and input from state, county, and federal agencies, Indian tribes, and the public. These criteria were developed by BLM to assure that the planning process and decision-making are focused on the

pertinent issues, and to ensure BLM avoids unnecessary data collection and analyses. The criteria were used at four stages of the planning process (resource inventory, assessment of the current situation [which includes a description of current BLM guidance, discussion of existing problems and opportunities to resolve them], formulation of alternatives, and selection of the Preferred Alternative). The basic planning criteria are identified in Section 202 of FLPMA. Planning criteria specific to resources are listed in Appendix B.

The basic planning criteria are identified in Section 202 of FLPMA:

- Follow the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
- Use a systematic interdisciplinary approach, fully considering physical, biological, economic, and social aspects of public land management.
- Identify, designate, protect, and specially manage ACECs.
- Consider the relative significance of public land products, services, and use to local economies.
- Rely on the inventory of public lands, their resources, and other values to the extent such information is available.
- Consider present and potential uses of public lands.
- Consider the impact of federally approved actions on adjacent or nearby non-federal lands and on private land surface over federally owned subsurface minerals.
- Consider the relative scarcity of the values involved and alternative means and sites for realization of those values.
- Weigh the long-term benefits and consequences of proposed actions against short-term benefits and consequences.
- Comply with applicable pollution control laws, including state and federal air, water, noise, and other pollution standards and plans.
- Coordinate, to the extent consistent with public laws, resource planning and management programs of other federal departments and agencies, states, local governments, and Indian tribes.
- Provide the public with early notices and frequent opportunities to participate in the preparation of plans.
- Manage the public lands to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the lands.

Related Plans

Title II, Section 202 of FLPMA provides guidance for the land use planning process of BLM to coordinate planning efforts with Native American Indian tribes, other federal departments, and agencies of state and local governments. To accomplish this directive, BLM is instructed to keep informed of state, local,

and tribal plans; assure that consideration is given to such plans; and to assist in resolving inconsistencies between such plans and federal planning. The section goes on to state in Subsection (c)(9) that “Land use plans of the Secretary [of the Interior] under this section shall be consistent with State and local plans to the maximum extent he finds consistent with Federal law and the purposes of this Act.” The provisions of this section of FLPMA are echoed in Section 1610.3 of BLM Resource Management Planning regulations.

In keeping with the provision of this section, state, local, and tribal officials were made aware of the planning process through the previously described mailings and meetings. The following is a list of plans reviewed during the LHFO DRMP/DEIS planning efforts:

- Mohave County General Plan (1995);
- La Paz County Comprehensive Plan (March 2005 Revised Draft);
- San Bernardino County Plan (2001);
- Lake Havasu City General Plan (2001);
- Bullhead City General Plan (2002);
- Town of Parker General Plan (June 1996);
- Lower Colorado River Multiple Species Conservation Plan; and
- Lake Havasu Coordinated Fisheries Management Plan.